

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE
APPLICATION OF THE SPECIFIC NAME "PADI" LINNAEUS,
1758, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "APHIS PADI"
TO THE EUROPEAN BIRD CHERRY APHID (CLASS INSECTA,
ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By J. P. DONCASTER

(British Museum (Natural History), London)

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 1225)

It is the purpose of the present application to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers to validate the application of the specific name *padi* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Aphis padi*, to the common European Bird Cherry Aphid, in order to preserve a name which is appropriate and in common use, but the application of which in this sense is invalid according to the Rules.

2. The name *Aphis padi* Linnaeus is, and has been, applied by the majority of aphidologists to the European Bird Cherry Aphid, which, with the exception of one rather rare species, is the only aphid known to use *Prunus padus* as a primary host in Europe, although, according to the Rules, it would seem to apply to a totally unrelated species, the Mealy Plum Aphid. As the name *pruni* Geoffroy, 1762, has already been placed on the *Official List* for the Mealy Plum Aphid (*Opinion* 397, July, 1956) *padi* cannot supplant it (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 270, Conclusion 42(1)(b)), but the name *padi* cannot now be used in any other sense without appropriate action by the Commission.

3. Linnaeus (*Syst. Nat.* (Ed. 10) 1 : 451) gives the following entry under the heading "APHIS" :

Padi. 7. A. Pruni Padi,

Reaum. ins. 3. t. 23. f. 9. 10.

Habitat in Pruno Pado.

4. As Linnaeus did not describe *padi* and his citation of a host species (*Prunus padus*) does not, according to Conclusion 21 of the Commission (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 256), in itself constitute an "indication", the aphid can

be identified only from the citation of Réaumur's figures 9 and 10, which show aphids attacking leaves of plum. It must be accepted that the description in Réaumur's text (p. 317), relating to these figures is to be identified as the Mealy Plum Aphid, as this has been decided by *Opinion* 397. But as the reference to Réaumur cited for *padi* is identical with that cited for *pruni*, it would therefore appear that *padi* must, on the same reasoning, also be the Mealy Plum Aphid, unless it is contended that either or both of Réaumur's figures depict a species different from the one he described, for which there appears to be no valid evidence. Indeed, not only does Réaumur's description of the Mealy Plum Aphid (p. 317) include a reference to both figures 9 and 10 together, but earlier in his account (p. 296) he seems to imply that these figures illustrate two different sorts of damage caused by the same species.

5. This view, however, was not accepted by Theobald (1927, *Aphididae of Gt. Britain* 2 : 403) who, though he did not doubt that Réaumur's figure 9 applied to the Mealy Plum Aphid, considered that figure 10 applied to the unrelated Leaf-curling Plum Aphid and restricted the name *padi* to the latter. Theobald's interpretation was followed by many entomologists, who consequently found themselves at variance with other workers; but, in any case, the divergence of opinion on the identity of *Aphis padi* Linnaeus would appear to show that, if it is not the Mealy Plum Aphid, it must be considered unidentifiable.

6. The case for validating the name *padi* for the Bird Cherry Aphid is strong. Not only is the name highly appropriate in that it indicates the only known primary host of the species in Europe, but most authors of major works on aphid systematics have used the name *padi* in this sense. They include Schrank, who published the first clearly recognisable description of the Bird Cherry Aphid under this name (1801, *Fauna Boica* 2 : 115), Kaltenbach, Walker, Koch, del Guercio, van der Goot, Mordvilko, Börner and Hille Ris Lambers. The morphology and biology of the Bird Cherry Aphid have been described by Rogerson (1947, *Bull. ent. Res.* 38(1) : 158), who used the now widely accepted combination *Rhopalosiphum padi* (Linnaeus). The validation of *padi* for the Bird Cherry Aphid, therefore, would stabilise a name already well established and about the application of which there is a wide measure of agreement.

7. Although, as already noted, the citation of a host plant unaccompanied by any description does not constitute a valid "indication" under the existing *Règles*, it cannot be doubted that, when Linnaeus cited *Prunus padus* as the host for his species *Aphis padi*, he intended to convey that that name applied to the European Bird Cherry Aphid, since the citation of that host is entirely inappropriate for the species figured by Réaumur on the plate cited by Linnaeus. Thus, a solution on the lines now recommended would not only serve the

valuable purpose of stabilising the name for the European Bird Cherry Aphid but would also be in harmony with the intention of Linnaeus, even though under the present *Règles* he failed to give effect to that intention.

8. For the reasons stated above, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked :—

(1) to use its Plenary Powers to direct that the nominal species *Aphis padi* Linnaeus, 1758, be interpreted by reference to the description given therefor by Schrank in 1801 (*Faun. boic.* 2 : 115) ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned specific name on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—

padi Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Aphis padi*, the entry so to be made to be endorsed that the nominal species so named be interpreted in accordance with the directions given under the Plenary Powers in (1) above.

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL BY A. E. ELLIS REGARDING THE
“VIVIPARUS/PALUDINA” COMPLEX (CLASS GASTROPODA)**

By **MRS. W. S. S. VAN DER FEEN**
(*Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, Holland*)

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 857)

(For the proposal in this case see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 13 : 38—43)

(Letter, dated 31st May 1957, communicated by A. E. Ellis)

In the first place I have to thank you for your reprint, proposing the stabilisation of the names of the two European *Viviparus*. I hope it will be accepted in this way, although there will result a lot of confusion with names used by central-European conchologists.